



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/046,666	01/16/2002	John C. Hardwick	03397-036001	1168
26171	7590	08/21/2006	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C. P.O. BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			HARPER, V PAUL	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2626	

DATE MAILED: 08/21/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/046,666	Applicant(s) HARDWICK, JOHN C.	
	Examiner V. Paul Harper	Art Unit 2626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-77 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-77 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

1. Claims 1-75 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 1 and 38 preempt abstract ideas and do not appear to result in a practical application (i.e., produce a useful, concrete or tangible result; see "Interim Guidelines for Examination of Patent Applications for Patent Subject Matter Eligibility" pp. 1, 23, 58). In these cases, the end result is a combining of first signal samples with second signal samples, which is not useful, concrete, or tangible.

Claims 2-37 and 39-75 are rejected for failing to cure the deficiencies of the above rejected nonstatutory claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-6, 16, 27, 28, 37-41, 43, 44, 59, 60, 62 and 63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Griffin et al. (U.S. Patent 5,701,390), hereinafter referred to as Griffin, in view of Barnwell et al. ("Speech Coding: A computer laboratory textbook," 1966, John Wiley & Sons, Inc.), hereinafter referred to as Barnwell.

Regarding **claim 1**, Griffin discloses a method for the synthesis of MBE-based coded speech using regenerated phase information. Griffin's method includes the following:

- dividing the speech model parameters into frames, wherein a frame of speech model parameters includes pitch information, voicing information determining the voicing state in one or more frequency regions, and spectral information (col. 3, lines 4-12; col. 9, lines 28-35);
- computing a first digital filter using a first frame of speech model parameters, wherein the frequency response of the first digital filter corresponds to the spectral information in frequency regions where the voicing state equals the selected voicing state (Fig. 2, col. 4, lines 38-65; digital filters are used to synthesize the speech, excited by the appropriate input [v/uv]); and col. 13, line 60 through col. 14, line 7);
- computing a second digital filter using a second frame of speech model parameters, wherein the frequency response of the second digital filter corresponds to the spectral information in frequency regions where the voicing state equals the selected voicing state (Fig. 2, col. 4, lines 38-65; parameters from sequential packets

Art Unit: 2626

are loaded creating different filters, which are excited according to voicing state; and col. 13, line 60 through col. 14, line 7, sequential packets can overlap).

- combining the first signal samples with the second signal samples to produce a set of digital speech samples corresponding to the selected voicing state (Fig. 2, Synthetic speech produced).

As stated above, Griffin teaches the use of multiple filters (with spectral and fundamental frequency information during the synthesis process [col. 4, lines 55-59] where it might be argued that the use of fundamental frequency information determines a set of pulse locations), but Griffin does not specifically teach the following:

- determining a set of pulse locations;
- producing a set of first signal samples from the first digital filter and the pulse locations;
- producing a set of second signal samples from the second digital filter and the pulse locations;

However, the examiner contends that these concepts were well known in the art, as taught by Barnwell.

In the same field of endeavor, Barnwell teaches speech coding where a filter is “programmed” with coefficients and excited with pulses (pp. 85-89, Fig. 5.2), where the pulses will necessarily have a separation (pitch period—location) and sequential sets of samples (from frames or subframes) will produce a signal.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Griffin by specifically providing the features,

Art Unit: 2626

as taught by Barnwell, because it is well known in the art at the time of invention for the purpose of producing synthesized speech at a decoder using low bandwidth transmissions (Barnwell, p. 85, Introduction), and furthermore Barnwell illustrates (clarifies) the connection between the fundamental frequency (as taught by Griffin) and pulse locations as claimed when used to excite a filter (programmed with spectral information) during a voiced state. Barnwell also illustrates the sequential nature of the process: a first set of spectral coefficients program the first digital filter and when excited produce the first set of signal samples; the second set of spectral coefficients program the second filter and when excited produce the second set of signal samples, etc. These outputs are combined to produce the reconstituted digital signal.

Regarding **claim 2**, Griffin in view of Barnwell teaches everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 1). In addition, Griffin teaches “wherein the frequency response of the first digital filter and the frequency response of the second digital filter are zero in frequency regions where the voicing state does not equal the selected voicing state” (col. 13, line 62 through col. 14, line 6).

Regarding **claim 3**, Griffin in view of Barnwell teaches everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 2). In addition, Griffin teaches “wherein the spectral information includes a set of spectral magnitudes representing the speech spectrum at integer multiples of a fundamental frequency” (col. 4, lines 55-61).

Regarding **claim 4**, Griffin in view of Barnwell teaches everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 2). In addition, Griffin teaches “wherein the speech model parameters are generated by decoding a bit stream formed by a speech encoder” (col. 9, lines 26-30).

Regarding **claim 5**, Griffin in view of Barnwell teaches everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 2). In addition, Griffin teaches “wherein the voicing information determines which frequency regions are voiced and which frequency regions are unvoiced” (col. 13, line 60 through col. 14, line 5).

Regarding **claim 6**, Griffin in view of Barnwell teaches everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 5). In addition, Griffin in view of Barnwell (see rejection of claim 1) teaches “wherein the selected voicing state is the voiced voicing state and the pulse locations are computed such that the time between successive pulse locations is determined at least in part from the pitch information” (in particular, Barnwell, Fig. 5.2, the pitch period determines the space between the excitation pulses).

Regarding **claim 16**, Griffin in view of Barnwell teaches everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 2). Barnwell teaches “wherein the selected voicing state is a pulsed voicing state” (p. 88, Fig. 5.2, voiced excitation can be generated by a pulse generator in support of low bandwidth transmission, see claim 1 rejection).

Regarding **claim 27**, Griffin in view of Barnwell teaches everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 1). In addition, Griffin teaches “wherein the spectral information includes a set of spectral magnitudes representing the speech spectrum at integer multiples of a fundamental frequency” (col. 4, lines 55-60).

Regarding **claim 28**, Griffin in view of Barnwell teaches everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 1). In addition, Barnwell teaches “wherein the speech model parameters are generated by decoding a bit stream formed by a speech encoder” (col. 3, lines 4-22).

Regarding **claim 37**, Griffin in view of Barnwell teaches everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 1). In addition, Griffin teaches “wherein the digital speech samples corresponding to the selected voicing state are further combined with other digital speech samples corresponding to other voicing states” (Fig. 2, col. 13, line 62 through col. 14, line 7).

Regarding **claim 38**, this claim has limitations similar to claim 1 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding **claim 39**, Griffin in view of Barnwell teaches everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 38). In addition, Griffin teaches “wherein the digital speech samples for the subframe corresponding to the selected voicing state are further

combined with digital speech samples for the subframe representing other voicing states" (Fig. 2, col. 13, line 62 through col. 14, line 7).

Regarding **claim 40**, Griffin in view of Barnwell teaches everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 39). In addition, Griffin teaches "wherein the voicing information includes one or more voicing decisions, with each voicing decision determining the voicing state of a frequency region in the subframe" (col. 13, line 62 through col. 14, line 7).

Regarding **claim 41**, Griffin in view of Barnwell teaches everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 40). In addition, Griffin teaches "wherein each voicing decision determines whether a frequency region in the subframe is voiced or unvoiced" (col. 13, line 62 through col. 14, line 7).

Regarding **claim 43**, Griffin in view of Barnwell teaches everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 41). In addition, Barnwell teaches "wherein each voicing decision further determines whether a frequency region in the subframe is pulsed" (Fig. 5.2 voicing selected the pulse generator that generates the appropriate frequency response when passed through the filter.

Regarding **claim 44**, Griffin in view of Barnwell teaches everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 41). In addition, Griffin in view of Barnwell teach "wherein the

Art Unit: 2626

selected voicing state is the voiced voicing state and the pulse locations depend at least in part on the decoded pitch information for the subframe" (Griffin, Fig. 2, decodes information resulting in V_k going to "voicing band determination" module; Barnwell, Fig. 5.2, pitch and voicing information go to pulse generator).

Regarding **claim 59**, this claim has limitations similar to claim 40 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding **claim 60**, this claim has limitations similar to claim 41 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding **claim 62**, this claim has limitations similar to claim 43 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding **claim 63**, this claim has limitations similar to claim 44 and is rejected for the same reasons.

3. Claims 7, 42, 45, 46, 49, 61, 64, 65 and 68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Griffin in view of Barnwell and further in view of well known prior art (MPEP 2144.03).

Regarding **claims 7, 42, 45, 61 and 64** Griffin in view of Barnwell teaches everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 6, 41, 60, 63, respectively), but Griffin in view of Barnwell does not specifically teach “the pulse locations are reinitialized if consecutive frames or subframes are predominately not voiced, and future determined pulse locations do not substantially depend on speech model parameters corresponding to frames or subframes prior to such reinitialization.” However, the examiner takes official notice of the fact that reinitialization after a period of non-pulsed operation was well known in the art.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Griffin in view of Barnwell, because voiced operation is more accurate of the pulses are synchronized to the beginning of a voiced segment.

Regarding **claims 46, 49, 65 and 68** Griffin in view of Barnwell teaches everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 45, 43, 63, and 62, respectively), but Griffin in view of Barnwell does not specifically teach “the frequency responses of the first impulse response and the second impulse response correspond to the decoded spectral information in voiced frequency regions and the frequency responses are approximately zero in other frequency regions.” However, the examiner takes official notice of the fact that a pulsed excitation will generate a frequency response and that the non-voiced segments will typically have a much lower energy response.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Griffin in view of Barnwell, because voiced operation is more accurate if the pulses are synchronized to the beginning of a voiced segment.

Allowable Subject Matter

(Assuming the 35 U.S.C. 101 rejections are overcome)

4. Claims 8-15, 17-26, 29-36, 47, 48, 50-58, 66, 67 and 69-77 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Note the 112 2nd rejections of claims 47, 48, 50-58, 66, 67 and 69-77 has precedence.

Regarding claims 10, 19, 31, 50 and 69, Griffin discloses the synthesis of MBE-based coded speech, but Griffin does not teach determining FFT coefficients from the decoded model parameters for the first frame in frequency regions where the voicing state equals the selected voicing state; processing the FFT coefficients with an inverse FFT to compute first time-scaled signal samples; interpolating and resampling the first time-scaled signal samples to produce first time-corrected signal samples; and multiplying the first time-corrected signal samples by a window function to produce the first digital filter. Thus the cited prior art alone or in combination, does not fairly suggest or disclose the claimed combination of features.

Regarding claims 8, 17 and 29, Griffin discloses method for reconstructing the spectral envelope and voicing information for each of a plurality of frames, but Griffin does not teach that the first digital filter is computed as the product of a periodic signal and a pitch-dependent window signal, and the period of the periodic signal is determined from the pitch information for the first frame. Thus the cited prior art alone or in combination, does not fairly suggest or disclose the claimed combination of features.

Regarding claims 25, 47 and 66, Griffin discloses method for synthesizing speech that includes the use of sinusoidal oscillators determined in part from the from the fundamental frequency, but Griffin does not teach that the pulse location corresponds to a time offset associated with an impulse in an impulse sequence, the first signal samples are computed by convolving the first digital filter with the impulse sequence, and the second signal samples are computed by convolving the second digital filter with the impulse sequence.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

Art Unit: 2626

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to V. Paul Harper whose telephone number is (571) 272-7605. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Hudspeth can be reached on (571) 272-7843. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

3/20/06

V. Paul Harper
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2654

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "V. Paul Harper". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.